SRI BAPU GOWDA.—Mr Gurupadappa is elected on Janatha party ticket. The followers of the accused are after him. Threatening letters have been written to him and the life of A.P.C.M. Chairman is also in danger. I request the Government to give all protection to Gurupadappa.

SRI D. DEVARAJ URS.—Why does not the hon'ble Member ask them to write to me? I am not aware of all these things. It is a question of a person and it cannot be played with according to politics. Politics may be anything Today a person may be supporting the Congress and tomorrow he may be supporting the Janatha Party and vice versa. Therefore, I can assure that Government is not going to countenance or relax on this issue. If it is a question of committing murders on the basis of political alligdments, I can assure the hon'ble member that whoever he may be, action will be taken according to law. After all, the hon'ble member is also depending upon some hearsay. Let him ask Gurupadappa to write to me, and I shall investigate further into the matter- We are not interested in relaxing. We have not received any letter from Gurupadappa or from the local police. Then how does he expect us to take any action?

(ii) *re.* Alleged favour shown to a tenant by Mysore City Municipal Administrator, in demolition of shops at Devaraj Market, Mysore.

SRI K. PUTTASWAMY (Chamundeswari).—Madam, I beg to call the attention of the Minister for Municipal Administration and political Pensions to the alleged favour shown to a tenant by the Mysore City Municipal Administrator in the matter of demolition of shops at Devaraj Market, Mysore.

SRI D. K. NAIKAR (Minister for Municipal Administration and Political Pensions).—Madam, I wish to make the following statement.

M/s. T. Adinarayana Setty and Sons, tenant of shop No. 1 and 2, Devaraj Market, Corporation of the City of Mysore, Mysore applied for permission on 24th January 1977 for repairing the cracks developed in the building. On 2nd February 1977 M/s. T. Adinarayana Setty and Sons submitted four copies of the proposed plan for the alterations of the two shops. Again on 10th February 1977 he requested permission for enclosing the front verandah shops Nos. 1 and 2 expressing willingness to pay the enhanced rent to be mutually agreed upon for the said additional space. The shops were inspected by the Admidistrator on 29th March 1977 along with the Municipal Commissioner and other Officers. It was observed that the roof of verandah portion of the shop building had developed cracks which needed immediate repairs But there was not imminent danger to the

occupants or to the public who move about nearby as stated by M/s. T. Adinarayana Setty and Sons. The Administrator ordered that the subject might be placed before the Advisory Council at its meeting to be held on 30th April 1977 for a policy decison in such cases where tenants come forward to effect repairs at their costs provided they have no claim whatsoever on the municipality for the costs incurred by them.

Before the meeting could be held, it came to notice of the Executive Engineer, City Municipal Council, Mysore that M/s. T. Adinarayana Setty and Sons were effecting alterations and repairs. The Executive Engineer therefore served a notice on M/s. T. Adinarayana Setty and Sons under section 187 of Karnataka Municipalities Act 1964 on 15th April 1977 to stop the work and to intimate the action. As there was no reply, the provisional order and notice under section 187 (9) (a) of the Karnataka Municipalities Act were served on M/s. T. Adinarayana Setty and Sons by the Commissioner, City Municipal Council, Mysore on 20th April 1977 to remove all the unauthorised alterations and improvements effected by them. Since there was no response from M/s. T. Adinarayana Setty and Sons, the confirmation order under section 187 (9) (c) was served on M/s. T. Adinarayana Setty and Sons, on 29th April 1977 on the report of the Executive Engineer On 28th April 1977, M/s. T. Adinarayana Setty and Sons in letter dated 22nd April 1977 informed the City Municipal Council that the work carried by them was in accordance with the law etc. In the meanwhile, M/s. T. Adinarayana Setty and Sons, approached the Vacation Civil Judge, Mysore on 20th May 1977 for a temporary injunction restraining the City Municipal Council from interfering with its construction. This request was not granted and the case was posted to hearing on 30th May 1977. On 18th May 1977 eviction order under section 4 of the Mysore Public Premises Unauthorised Eviction Act 1961 and amended Act 32 of 1969 was issued on the report of the Executive Engineer, City Municipal Council, Mysore.

The question of grant of licence to M/s. T. Adinarayana Setty and Sons was discussed at the Advisory Council Meeting held on 30th April 1977 and it was deferred for want of a detailed report in the matter. In the meanwhile M/s. Adinarayana Setty and Sons in their letter dated 23rd May 1977 addressed to the Commissioner, in reply to eviction order dated 18th May 1977, represented that their action to repair the shops No. 1 and 2 was with the sole intention of restoring and safeguarding the premises as tenant and was not aimed at flouting the principles of Law and if this was a lapse on their part, they deeply regret for the same. They also requested for the

compounding of their action and for permitting them to carry on the work undertaken in view of the ensuing monsoon. The subject was again placed before the Advisory Council on 30th May 1977 for a decision. The Advisory Council unanimously decided to authorise the Administrator to negotiate and to settle the matter keeping in view the interest of the Municipality. On 2nd June 1977 the Administrator in Consultation with the Commissioner, City Municipal Council, settled the issue.

Accordingly M/s. T Adinarayana Setty and Sons filed a memo on 2nd June 1977 in the Court of I Munsiff for the dismissal of the suit and credited to the City Municipal Council, Mysore a compounding fee of Rs. 300 on 6th June 1977 and got the proposed plan for the alteration, repairs and improvement approved by the Executive Engineer. They also agreed to bear the entire cost and effect all the repairs, alterations etc. without affecting the existing architectural symetry and beauty of the structure of the adjacent shops and without deviation of the existing premises. On account of the alterations, addition etc., made by them to shop No. 1 and 2 at their cost, they have agreed to pay 75% of the existing rent over and above in addition to the payment of Rs 199-50 for the additional space consequent upon the verandah enclosed.

The City Municipal Council has settled the case to the best advantage of the City Municipal Council, keeping in view the financial interests viz ;

(a) If these repairs and alteration and enclosing the verandah had been done at the cost of the City Municipal Council, Mysore, it would have Rs. 35,000 approximately.

(b) On account of the repairs, alterations and improvements made by M[s. T. Adinarayana Setty and Sons at their own cost, it has yielded a monthly rent of Rs. 584-90 as against Rs. 220-25 all along realised.

SRI K. PUTTASWAMY.—There is now an Administrator and whatever the Administrator does we have to impliedly feel that the Government approval is there I would like to know from the Government whether they have taken care to enquire into the present rental value of the premises and further the action of the tenant in demolishing the building without any approval from the owner of the building, the owner being the Municipality itself. Even if he has done as a tenant of an ordinary building, it would have been an offence. Secondly, he has done it without the permission and licence of the Municipality and went to the Court for a temporary injunction which the Court refused. Then the tenant rushed to the Municipality

7th trying to get it compounded. I want to know whether they have been into consideration this recalcitrant attitude of the tenant. It is stated that they have taken care to see that the architectural beauty of the cemetry is maintained. When they have permitted the owner to enclose the verandah, which runs all through the market building in Sayajirao Road, does it not affect the architectural beauty? The contention of the Hon'ble Minister is that they have been able to get additional rent. Can it be a consolation when a sizeable area is allowed to be enclosed in the busiest portion of the City. *viz.*, Sayajirao Road?

Further, the Hon'ble Minister has stated that the Government is going to spend Rs. 35,000 Is the Municipality so hard up for funds? The Market building which faces Sayajirao Road happens to be a very old building and the land value has appreciated enormously. It has to be demolished at least in stages and constructed and while constructing care should be taken to construct a multi-storeyed building because the land is of highest value. Is it wise for the Municipality to allow the tenant to repair, construct or reconstrct a small portion to prevent the Municipality to put up a multi-storeyed building in due course and exploit that area to the best advantage of the City Municipality?

SRI D. K. NAIKAR.—On the information furnished by the Administrator of the Municipality, I made a statement to the Call Attention Notice given by the hon'ble member. The hon'ble member has put a series of questions for clarification I believe that my own statement is very clear that to the best advantage of the Municipality the Administrator and other officers of the Municipality have taken a decision to enhance the rent after allowing him to construct the building according to the plans and estimates submitted by the party under the supervision of the Municipal Engineer. According to my knowledge, it is apparently clear under the supervision of the Engineer that the beauty of the place is maintained and there is nothing wrong Secondly, so far as the rent of the shops is concerned the hon'ble member said that the place is very important and more rent would have been realised if it had been brought under public auction or otherwise.

SRI K. PUTTASWAMY.—I never said about public auction. All through our line of thinking is that tenants should not be evicted-law abiding tenants should never be evicted!

SRI D.K. NAIKAR.—I am grateful to the hon'ble member. In my statement it is mentioned that 75 per cent of the rent has been increased after improvement has been effected. In my humble

opinion it is reasonable and it is not done on the whims of the Administrator. The Administrator was pleased to place the subject before the Advisory body and the Advisory body took a decision authorising the Administrator to settle the matter to the best advantage of the Municipality, which he has done

Another question that was raised by the hon'ble member was that after allowing the party to enclose the verdandah the beauty of the area has really been marred according to him. I said earlier also that it was done under the supervision of the Executive Engineer and according to my knowledge there is no demage done to the beauty of the structure.

Strike by the Employees of the Prajamata and Janavani

SRI M.S. KRISHNAN.—Madam Speaker, I have given a notice under Rule 312 regarding the strike of the employees of some newspapsrs. When I spoke about is two days back, you were pleased to say that it is better to take it up when the Hon'ble Chief Minister is present.

MADAM SPEAKER.—Is it not better that we take it up on Monday because today we are having important demands to be discussed?

SRI M. S. KRISHNAN.—It is a very important matter and the Hon'ble Chief Minister was concerned with it, and he had also stated that he would call them and talk to them and that he would take immediate action. The employees of Prajamatha and Janavani have gone on strike and Vishala Karnataka is also locked up.

SRI K. H. PATIL.—About Vishala Karnataka, the matter has already been discussed.

SRI M. S. KRISHNAN.—We would like to know what positive action has been taken.

SRI D. DEVARAJ URS (Chief Minister).—Immediately after I made the statement, I called the Labour Secretary to Government and the Labour Commissioner and had a discussion. Some of the representatives of the Newspapers employees also came and met me. In some of the establishments of these Newspapers they have implemented the Wage Board Award; some have yet to implement it, and some have implemented it partially. This is the positiot Wherever implementation has taken place it is all right. If implementation is not there, Government has power to prosecute I have to call the establishment people and ask them to implement the Wage Board Award or we have to take recourse under the law to prosecute.